



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/520,787	01/11/2005	Kenichi Miyoshi	L9289.04193	2438

24257 7590 09/30/2010

Dickinson Wright PLLC
James E. Ledbetter, Esq.
International Square
1875 Eye Street, NW., Suite 1200
WASHINGTON, DC 20006

EXAMINER

MIAH, LITON

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2617

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

09/30/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/520,787	Applicant(s) MIYOSHI ET AL.	
	Examiner LITON MIAH	Art Unit 2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 July 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 20-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 20-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This Action is in response to Applicant's amendment filed on July 16, 2010.

Claims 20-37 are now pending in the present application. **This Action is made FINAL.**

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office Action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

Art Unit: 2617

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
5. Claims 20, 29, 30, 34, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ikeda et al (US 2002/0058593), hereinafter 'Ikeda' in view of Khan et al (US 2002/0064167), hereinafter 'Khan'.

For claims 20 and 34, Ikeda discloses a base station apparatus/radio receiving method using an automatic repeat request (ARQ) procedure, said base station apparatus comprising:

a receiver configured to receive data from a terminal apparatus in an uplink (**paragraph 0010 and 0047**);

an error detector configured to perform an error detection for the data by using an error-detecting code (**paragraph 0011 and 0047**); and

a transmitter configured to transmit, to the terminal apparatus: (i) an acknowledgment signal, when said error detector detects no error (**paragraph 0005 and 0015**);

(ii) a negative acknowledgement (NACK) signal when said error detector detects an error (**paragraph 0005 and 0015**); and

(iii) a control signal, pairing with the ACK signal or the NACK signal, for governing operations including a retransmission, and no transmission performed in. the terminal apparatus (**paragraph 0004, 0020 and 0064**).

Ikeda fails to explicitly disclose that the operation of the governing operation including a new transmission. In the same field of endeavor, **Khan** discloses a control signal,

Art Unit: 2617

pairing with the ACK signal or NACK signal, for governing operations including a new transmission performed in the terminal apparatus **(See at least abstract; paragraph 0010 and 0017)**. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Ikeda with the governing operations including a new transmission as taught in Khan reference to efficiently utilize channel resources while allowing for scheduling flexibility.

For claim 29, Ikeda further discloses a receiver configured to receive an acknowledgment/negative-acknowledgment (ACK/NACK) signal and a control signal which are transmitted from the base station apparatus according to claim 20 **(paragraph 0004-0005 and 0015)**; and a transmitter configured to transmit data, based on the ACK/NACK signal and the control signal **(paragraph 0004-0005 and 0015)**.

For claims 30 and 35, Ikeda discloses a terminal apparatus/radio transmitting method using an automatic repeat request (ARQ)~the terminal apparatus comprising: a transmitter configured to perform operations, including a retransmission and no transmission of data to a base station apparatus **(paragraph 0004, 0020 and 0064)**; and a receiver configured to receive an acknowledgment/negative-acknowledgment (ACK/NACK) signal, which is transmitted based on a result of an error detection for the data using an error-detecting, code in the base station apparatus, and a control signal which is transmitted from the base station apparatus **(paragraph 0004-0005, 0015 and**

Art Unit: 2617

0064);

wherein the operations are governed based on the ACK/NACK signal and the control signal (**paragraph 0004, 0020 and 0064**).

Ikeda fails to explicitly disclose that the operation of the governing operation including a new transmission. In the same field of endeavor, **Khan** discloses a control signal, pairing with the ACK signal or NACK signal, for governing operations including a new transmission performed in the terminal apparatus (**See at least abstract; paragraph 0010 and 0017**). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Ikeda with the governing operations including a new transmission as taught in Khan reference to efficiently utilize channel resources while allowing for scheduling flexibility.

6. Claims 21-24 and 31-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ikeda et al (US 2002/0058593), hereinafter 'Ikeda' in view of Khan et al (US 2002/0064167), hereinafter 'Khan' and further in view of Hershey (US 6,662,330).

For claims 21 and 31, Ikeda fails to explicitly disclose that the operation that resumes transmission. In the same field of endeavor, **Hershey** discloses the control signal is for governing the operation that the base station apparatus resumes a transmission after performing no transmission (**See at least col. 1 [ln. 25-49]**). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to

Art Unit: 2617

combine Ikeda and Khan with the governing operations including to resume transmission as taught in Hershey reference to reduce the number of required retransmission.

For claims 22 and 32, Ikeda fails to explicitly disclose that the operation that resumes transmission. In the same field of endeavor, **Hershey** discloses the control signal is for governing the operations that the base station apparatus performs no transmission and keeps data in a buffer **(See at least col. 1 [ln. 25-49])**. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Ikeda and Khan with the governing operations including to resume transmission as taught in Hershey reference to reduce the number of required retransmission.

For claims 23 and 33, Ikeda fails to explicitly disclose that the operation that resumes transmission. In the same field of endeavor, **Hershey** discloses the control signal is for governing the operations that the base station apparatus suspends a transmission and performs no transmission **(See at least col. 1 [ln. 25-49])**. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Ikeda and Khan with the governing operations including to resume transmission as taught in Hershey reference to reduce the number of required retransmission.

For claim 24, Ikeda fails to explicitly disclose that the operation that resumes transmission. In the same field of endeavor, **Hershey** discloses the control signal is a suspend signal, the suspend signal for governing the operations that the base station apparatus suspends a transmission and performs no transmission, or a resume signal, the resume signal for governing the operation that the radio transmitting apparatus resumes a transmission after performing no transmission (**See at least col. 1 [ln. 25-49]**). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Ikeda and Khan with the governing operations including to resume transmission as taught in Hershey reference to reduce the number of required retransmission.

7. Claims 25-28, 36, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ikeda et al (US 2002/0058593), hereinafter 'Ikeda' in view of Khan et al (US 2002/0064167), hereinafter 'Khan' and further in view of Whitehill et al (US 2002/0191573)), hereinafter 'Whitehill'.

For claim 25, Ikeda fails to explicitly disclose that a channel quality measurer. In the same field of endeavor, **Whitehill** discloses a channel quality measurer configured to measure a channel quality between the terminal apparatus and the base station apparatus, wherein the transmitter transmits the control signal based on the channel quality (**See at least paragraph 0054**). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Ikeda and Khan with the

Art Unit: 2617

channel quality measurer as taught in Whitehill reference to enable a network to deliver a multimedia content with optimum speed and reliability.

For claim 26, Ikeda fails to explicitly disclose that a channel quality measurer. In the same field of endeavor, **Whitehill** discloses the control signal is for governing the operations that the terminal apparatus performs no transmission and keeps data in a buffer when the channel quality is equal to or less than a threshold (**See at least paragraph 0054**). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Ikeda and Khan with the channel quality measurer as taught in Whitehill reference to enable a network to deliver a multimedia content with optimum speed and reliability.

For claim 27, Ikeda fails to explicitly disclose that a channel quality measurer. In the same field of endeavor, **Whitehill** discloses the control signal is for governing the operations that the terminal apparatus performs no transmission and keeps data in a buffer when the channel quality is equal to or less than a threshold, and the control signal is for governing the operation that the terminal apparatus resumes a transmission after performing no transmission when the channel quality become greater than the threshold (**See at least paragraph 0054**). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Ikeda and Khan with the channel quality measurer as taught in Whitehill reference to enable a network to deliver a multimedia content with optimum speed and reliability.

For claim 28, Ikeda further discloses the base station apparatus performs:

(i) transmitting an ACK signal when said error detector detects no error for the data
(paragraph 0015).

Ikeda fails to explicitly disclose that a channel quality measurer. In the same field of endeavor, **Whitehill** discloses (ii) transmitting a NACK signal when said error detector detects an error for the data and the channel quality is greater than a threshold; (iii) transmitting the control signal for governing the operations that the terminal apparatus performs no transmission and keeps data in a buffer when said error detector detects an error for the data and the channel quality is equal to or less than the threshold; and (iv) transmitting the control signal for governing the operation that the terminal apparatus resumes a transmission after performing no transmission when the channel quality become greater than the threshold **(See at least paragraph 0029 and 0054)**. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Ikeda and Khan with the channel quality measurer as taught in Whitehill reference to enable a network to deliver a multimedia content with optimum speed and reliability.

For claim 36, Ikeda fails to explicitly disclose that a channel quality measurer. In the same field of endeavor, **Whitehill** discloses a channel quality measurer, wherein the transmitter transmits a NACK signal when said error detector detects an error for the data and a channel quality measurer determines that the channel quality is greater than a threshold **(See at least paragraph 0054)**. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of

Art Unit: 2617

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Ikeda and Khan with the channel quality measurer as taught in Whitehill reference to enable a network to deliver a multimedia content with optimum speed and reliability.

For claim 37, Ikeda fails to explicitly disclose that a channel quality measurer. In the same field of endeavor, **Whitehill** discloses a channel quality measurer, wherein the control signal governs operations that: the terminal apparatus performs no transmission and keeps data in a buffer when said error detector detects an error for the data and a channel quality measurer determines that the channel quality is equal to or less than a first threshold and greater than a second threshold, the terminal apparatus resumes a transmission after performing no transmission when the channel quality measurer determines that the channel quality becomes greater than the first threshold, and the terminal apparatus stops and reschedules a transmission after performing no transmission when the channel quality measurer determines that the channel quality becomes equal to or less than the second threshold (**See at least paragraph 0029 and 0054**). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Ikeda and Khan with the channel quality measurer as taught in Whitehill reference to enable a network to deliver a multimedia content with optimum speed and reliability.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments, filed on July 16, 2010, with respect to **claims 20, 30, 34, and 35** have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection

Art Unit: 2617

necessitated by the new limitations added to claims **20, 30, 34, and 35**. See the above rejection of claims **20-37** for the relevant citations found in Ikeda, Khan, Hershey and Whitehill disclosing the newly added limitations.

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Liton Miah whose telephone number is (571)270-3124. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 7:30am to 5:00pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

Art Unit: 2617

supervisor, Rafael Perez-Gutierrez can be reached on (571)272-7915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

LM

/Rafael Pérez-Gutiérrez/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617